

*CCWRO has been advocating for impoverished families since the early 1980. Kevin Aslanian is a former welfare recipient who is now the executive director of CCWRO. CCWRO has examined the TANF program since its enactment and has witnessed a lot of impoverished families and children who have experiences severe misery due to the TANF program. The primary beneficiaries of the TANF program have been the state governments fleecing the TANF program since its enactment.*

The TANF program is supposed to be the safety net for impoverished families of the United State of America. The TANF law provides that the State has to match the federal funds with at least 75% of what is known as “maintenance of effort” (MOE) money. Innocent taxpayers may think that these dollars are being used to assist the impoverished families of the United States of America. In reality this program is not a program that provides temporary assistance to needy families – it provides “Permanent Assistance to Needy States” (PANS).

Honesty would dictate that the name of the program should be changed. Dishonesty would retain the dishonest name of this program for it does not provide assistance to needy families for most part.

The evidence reveals that a mere 36% of the money is used to payments to families while the rest of the money is used for purposes other than providing assistance to needy families like Foster Care, Child Care, and primarily for State Budget Care.

Rather than looking at States manipulating the process to meet the work participation rates through caseload reduction credits scheme, Congress should look at the TANF program that is loaded with loopholes, such as considering money used for families not subject to work requirements as eligible for TANF funds for those expenditures meeting the silly requirement of “promoting job preparation, work, marriage, reducing out-of-wedlock births; and encouraging the formation of two-parent families”. States got the message loud and clear when TANF was enacted – this is all a shell game. We give you money called

“temporary assistance to needy families” and you can spend the money on “non-needy families” – hah hah hah.

And now some in Congress are appalled that States are using “case credits” to meet the so-called work participation rates. You should not be surprised at all. Congress let States know that although we call this program “temporary assistance to needy families” –blink-blink-blink- you can use it for non-needy families not subject to work requirements.

***AFDC program 70% of the money was used to “payment to families”. The evidence reveals that under TANF a meager 36% of the money is used for “payment to families”.***

The “Green Book” published by the House Ways and Means Committee reveals that in the AFDC program 70% of the money was used to “payment to families”. The evidence reveals that under TANF a meager 36% of the money is used for “payment to families”.

Below is a state-by-state percentage of TANF funds used by States during 2011 according to DHHS. A meager 8% of the TANF money is used for impoverished families in Arkansas. It is the worse state for the poor along with Illinois that uses only 8% of its money as payments to families. North Carolina, Michigan, Georgia, South Carolina, Idaho and Maryland use less than 20% of their TANF funds for poor families. Has Congress ever wondered what’s happening with this money? Impoverished families and children suffer while TANF money is fleeced by States and Congress acquiesces and with apparent Congressional support.

Nobody really cares about poor kids in America unless there are on 60 minutes. They do not make political contributions to Congress and do not have deep pockets. Many of their parents can’t even vote now days for they may not have a valid i.d. to vote.

## **CHART # 1 – State-by-state percentage of total TANF federal and MOE funds used for “Payment to Families” during FY 2011**

U.S. TOTAL	36%
ARKANSAS	8%
ILLINOIS	8%
NORTH CAROLINA	12%
MICHIGAN	14%
GEORGIA	15%
SOUTH CAROLINA	17%
IDAHO	18%
MARYLAND	19%
TEXAS	20%
CONNECTICUT	20%
PENNSYLVANIA	21%
MINNESOTA	22%
WISCONSIN	22%
FLORIDA	24%
INDIANA	24%
ARIZONA	25%
HAWAII	25%
NEW JERSEY	25%
NEBRASKA	26%
RHODE ISLAND	26%
COLORADO	26%
MISSOURI	28%
WASHINGTON	29%
MISSISSIPPI	29%
LOUISIANA	31%

DIST.OF COLUMBIA	31%
ALABAMA	33%
MASSACHUSETTS	33%
VERMONT	34%
UTAH	35%
OHIO	37%
NEW YORK	37%
OKLAHOMA	40%
NEVADA	40%
WYOMING	41%
NEW MEXICO	42%
VIRGINIA	43%
IOWA	43%
WEST VIRGINIA	43%
TENNESSEE	43%
DELAWARE	44%
KANSAS	45%
MONTANA	45%
NEW HAMPSHIRE	56%
NORTH DAKOTA	58%
OREGON	59%
CALIFORNIA	63%
KENTUCKY	65%
ALASKA	70%
SOUTH DAKOTA	73%
MAINE	76%

Source: Chart #2 below

## CHART # 2 - Summary of Federal TANF and State MOE Expenditures in FY 2011

Source: [http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/data/2011fin/table\\_b1.pdf](http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ofa/data/2011fin/table_b1.pdf)

STATE	TOTAL ASSISTANCE AND NON-ASSISTANCE EXPENDITURES	PAYMENT TO TANF ELIGIBLE FAMILIES	NON-ASSISTANCE	PERCENTAGE OF TANF FUNDS USED FOR PAYMENTS TO FAMILIES
<b>U.S. TOTAL</b>	<b>\$30,624,118,314</b>	<b>\$11,131,407,676</b>	<b>\$19,492,710,638</b>	<b>36%</b>
ALABAMA	\$184,763,017	\$60,565,282	\$124,197,735	33%
ALASKA	\$66,298,196	\$46,609,347	\$19,688,849	70%
ARIZONA	\$358,556,919	\$87,968,991	\$270,587,928	25%
ARKANSAS	\$186,593,246	\$15,706,228	\$170,887,018	8%
CALIFORNIA	\$6,674,677,301	\$4,221,005,090	\$2,453,672,211	63%
COLORADO	\$318,107,617	\$82,536,581	\$235,571,036	26%
CONNECTICUT	\$482,570,156	\$98,168,216	\$384,401,940	20%
DELAWARE	\$79,324,359	\$35,223,265	\$44,101,094	44%
DIST.OF COL.	\$249,872,756	\$77,011,103	\$172,861,653	31%
FLORIDA	\$834,073,269	\$196,198,069	\$637,875,200	24%
GEORGIA	\$561,502,767	\$85,820,475	\$475,682,292	15%
HAWAII	\$317,337,786	\$77,973,976	\$239,363,810	25%
IDAHO	\$25,888,064	\$4,734,754	\$21,153,310	18%
ILLINOIS	\$1,311,050,647	\$110,592,904	\$1,200,457,743	8%
INDIANA	\$292,230,235	\$71,524,114	\$220,706,121	24%
IOWA	\$195,699,997	\$83,834,174	\$111,865,823	43%
KANSAS	\$213,316,638	\$95,559,824	\$117,756,814	45%
KENTUCKY	\$246,939,849	\$161,452,160	\$85,487,689	65%
LOUISIANA	\$276,612,891	\$84,668,911	\$191,943,980	31%
MAINE	\$129,562,449	\$98,556,141	\$31,006,308	76%
MARYLAND	\$454,564,757	\$88,468,836	\$366,095,921	19%
MASSACHUSETTS	\$1,022,055,560	\$337,075,697	\$684,979,863	33%
MICHIGAN	\$1,376,629,731	\$193,973,371	\$1,182,656,360	14%
MINNESOTA	\$434,204,017	\$94,909,659	\$339,294,358	22%
MISSISSIPPI	\$109,841,555	\$31,795,625	\$78,045,930	29%
MISSOURI	\$323,315,070	\$91,316,362	\$231,998,708	28%
MONTANA	\$44,337,665	\$19,899,386	\$24,438,279	45%

<b>NEBRASKA</b>	\$111,646,298	\$28,498,774	\$83,147,524	<b>26%</b>
<b>NEVADA</b>	\$118,877,591	\$47,459,687	\$71,417,904	<b>40%</b>
<b>NEW HAMPSHIRE</b>	\$78,295,365	\$43,934,489	\$34,360,876	<b>56%</b>
<b>NEW JERSEY</b>	\$1,184,254,525	\$299,963,812	\$884,290,713	<b>25%</b>
<b>NEW MEXICO</b>	\$191,736,019	\$80,928,302	\$110,807,717	<b>42%</b>
<b>NEW YORK</b>	\$4,954,204,982	\$1,847,359,998	\$3,106,844,984	<b>37%</b>
<b>NORTH CAR.</b>	\$628,657,903	\$75,160,984	\$553,496,919	<b>12%</b>
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>	\$34,930,739	\$20,106,911	\$14,823,828	<b>58%</b>
<b>OHIO</b>	\$1,187,487,786	\$440,127,863	\$747,359,923	<b>37%</b>
<b>OKLAHOMA</b>	\$172,633,114	\$68,386,314	\$104,246,800	<b>40%</b>
<b>OREGON</b>	\$342,589,061	\$201,496,149	\$141,092,912	<b>59%</b>
<b>PENNSYLVANIA</b>	\$943,154,587	\$201,613,205	\$741,541,382	<b>21%</b>
<b>RHODE ISLAND</b>	\$139,895,762	\$35,767,841	\$104,127,921	<b>26%</b>
<b>SOUTH CAROL.</b>	\$237,488,686	\$39,258,511	\$198,230,175	<b>17%</b>
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>	\$31,084,340	\$22,669,301	\$8,415,039	<b>73%</b>
<b>TENNESSEE</b>	\$360,975,328	\$156,289,465	\$204,685,863	<b>43%</b>
<b>TEXAS</b>	\$810,494,208	\$158,860,696	\$651,633,512	<b>20%</b>
<b>UTAH</b>	\$116,358,468	\$40,456,983	\$75,901,485	<b>35%</b>
<b>VERMONT</b>	\$73,028,114	\$24,468,524	\$48,559,590	<b>34%</b>
<b>VIRGINIA</b>	\$287,626,635	\$122,953,059	\$164,673,576	<b>43%</b>
<b>WASHINGTON</b>	\$1,063,275,410	\$305,740,849	\$757,534,561	<b>29%</b>
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>	\$171,955,410	\$73,705,432	\$98,249,978	<b>43%</b>
<b>WISCONSIN</b>	\$576,566,670	\$127,764,803	\$448,801,867	<b>22%</b>
<b>WYOMING</b>	\$36,974,799	\$15,287,183	\$21,687,616	<b>41%</b>